

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

SANDRA RUSSELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

T-MOBILE USA, INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00255-MJP

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO SEAL

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Sandra Russell's Motion to Seal (Dkt. No. 51). Having reviewed the Motion, Defendant T-Mobile's response (Dkt. No. 57), and all supporting materials, the Court DENIES the Motion.

In support of her Response to Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. No. 44), Plaintiff filed under seal thirteen exhibits—Exhibits B, C, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, Q, R, U to the Declaration of Jeffery Musto (Dkt. No. 45)—on the basis that Defendant had designated those documents as confidential. (Mot. at 1.)

1 In response, Defendant argues that there are two reasons why the exhibits should not be
2 sealed. First, prior to Plaintiff filing her response, Defendant agreed to remove the confidentiality
3 designations on Exhibits Q and R. (Resp. at 2; Declaration of Giancarlo Urey (Dkt. No 58) ¶ 5.)
4 Second, Defendant also informed Plaintiff that the redaction of “non-party employee names
5 and/or ID numbers,” contained in the remaining exhibits, rather than sealing them in their
6 entirety, would be sufficient to address any confidentiality concerns. (Resp. at 3; Urey Decl. ¶ 5.)
7 The Court agrees with Defendant. Local Civil Rule 5(g)(1) requires parties to “explore all
8 alternative to filing a document under seal,” including “determine whether the designating party
9 will withdraw the confidential designation or will agree to redact the document so that sealing is
10 unnecessary,” while still “protect[ing] sensitive information by redacting sensitive information
11 . . . that the court does not need to consider.” Plaintiff’s filing of Exhibits Q and R under seal was
12 unnecessary because of Defendant’s withdrawal of the confidentiality designations as to those
13 documents. And, as the Party who originally designated Exhibits B, C, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, and
14 U as confidential, Defendant has shown that a less restrictive alternative to sealing is sufficient.
15 See Local Civ. R. 5(g)(3)(B). Therefore, the Court sees no reason why the documents should
16 remain under seal in their entirety.

17 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion to Seal is DENIED. The Clerk is directed to unseal and
18 file for public record the unredacted version of Exhibits Q and R to the Musto Declaration (Dkt.
19 No. 45). Within 14 days of this Order, Plaintiff is ORDERED to file for public record Exhibits
20 B, C, E, F, G, I, J, K, L, M, and U to the Musto Declaration (Dkt. No. 45) with redactions to the
21 non-party employee names and/or employee identification numbers.

22 //

23 //

1 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

2 Dated May 30, 2025.

3 

4 Marsha J. Pechman
5 United States Senior District Judge
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24